

### **REMARKS**

This responds to the Office Action mailed on May 21, 2007. Claims 1, 5, 19, 22 and 25-30 are amended, claims 7 and 9 are canceled; as a result, claims 1-6, 8 and 19-30 are now pending in this application.

#### **§101 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 25-30 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claims 25-30 such that “machine-readable medium” is “machine-readable storage medium.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 25-30 under 35 USC § 101 has been overcome.

#### **§102 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1-9 and 19-30 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Li (EP 0257581 A2). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration.<sup>1</sup>

#### **Claim 1-4**

With regard to claim 1, among the differences (as amended), claim 1 recites “wherein the first processor includes a type of hardware accelerator that is not included in the second processor. This limitation is set forth in claim 7. With regard to claim 7, the Office indicated that this limitation is disclosed by Li by memory 7 of figure 1 and registers 37 of figure 3. See Office Action at page 4. Application respectfully traverses. Figure 1 of Li relates to an internal configuration of a processing element 5. This does not disclose that one processor includes a hardware accelerator that is not included in the second processor. In contrast, this section of Li illustrates that the different processing elements have the same configuration. Figure 3 of Li relates to an internal configuration of connection control mechanism 8. This is an element within the processing element. This section also does not disclose that one processor includes a hardware accelerator that is not included in the second processor.

---

<sup>1</sup> *In re Dillon* 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ2d 1897, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (en banc), cert. denied, 500 U.S. 904 (1991).

Because Li does not disclose each element of claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102 has been overcome. Because the claims that depend from claim 1 depend from and further define claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of the dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 has been overcome.

#### Claim 5, 6 and 8

With regard to claim 5, Applicant has amended to include the limitations of claims 7 and 9. Among the differences (as amended), claim 5 recites “wherein the first processor includes a type of hardware accelerator that is not included in the second processor.” Based on the remarks set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 5 is patentable over Li.

In addition to the remarks set forth above regarding claim 1, Applicant has submits the following. Among the differences, claim 5 recites “wherein the first processor element in the first processor is configured to perform the first data process operation on data streams received into the expansion interface at least simultaneously in part with second data process operation performed by the second processor element in the second processor.” This limitation is set forth in claim 9. With regard to claim 9, the Office indicated that this limitation is disclosed by Li by referencing the rejections of claim 1-4 and 7-8. See Office Action at page 4. Application respectfully traverses. None of the cited sections of Li disclose the output from one processor is to be processed, at least simultaneously in part, by a second processor.

Because Li does not disclose each element of claim 5, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102 has been overcome. Because the claims that depend from claim 5 depend from and further define claim 5, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of the dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 has been overcome.

#### Claims 19-30

Claims 19-30 (as amended) include limitations that are similar to claim 1. In light of the remarks regarding claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Li does not disclose each element of claims 19-30. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 19-30 has been overcome.

### **RESERVATION OF RIGHTS**

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have addressed every assertion made in the Office Action. Applicant's silence regarding any such assertion does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record are relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((612) 371-2103) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,


LOUIS A. LIPPINCOTT

By their Representatives,  
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
(612) 371-2103

Date

11-26-07

By

  
Gregg A. Peacock  
Reg. No. 45,001

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 21st day of November 2007.

Name

Amy Moriarty

Signature

